

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on November 2, 2007, has been received, and carefully considered.

The specification has been amended at pages 3 and 14. It is considered that these inclusions do not introduce new matter.

The specification has been objected to as including allegedly improper legal terms. The Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically identify such legal terms and provide the Applicant with the corresponding MPEP section where it indicates that the use of such term is improper.

The specification has been amended to include sub-titles, where appropriate.

Favourable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections is therefore respectfully requested.

The objection to claim 6 is considered moot because claim 6 has been cancelled.

The rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is obviated by appropriate amendment.

Favourable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, and 8 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/31426. Claims 2-4 and 6-7 have

also been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/31426.

It is Applicant's position that the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest Applicants' invention, as amended.

Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

It is Applicant's position that the cited art does not disclose or suggest a ball bearing arrangement having the limitation *"the surface in a groove interacting with a rotatable unit being spherically shaped that up to maximum possible contact is obtained between the unit's outer surface and the corresponding outer surface of the groove"*.

The purpose of the present invention is to increase the loading possibilities for the ball bearing. This can be done by shaping each outer surface presented by the side loops to give the maximum contact between the ball and the wire. In other words, so that the maximum contact between the ball and the outer surface is achieved, the contact surface of each loop should more or less approach the spherical or cylindrical. By making the outer surface as a groove, the contact area is higher, as mentioned on page 12, line 35, and page 13, line 3, wherein the differences of wires with different cross sections are taught.

Accordingly, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the limitations of the present claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) are unsustainable, and urges favorable reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

It is believed that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early allowance to this effect is respectfully urged. If any final points remain that can be clarified by telephone, Examiner Charles is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicants hereby petition the Commissioner for Patents to extend the time for reply to the notice dated November 2, 2007, for three (3) months from February 2, 2008, to May 2, 2008. A duly completed credit card authorization form is attached to effect payment of the extension fee.

Respectfully submitted



Date: May 2, 2008

Malcolm J. MacDonald
Reg. No. 40,250
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 24